

Date of Dispatch: December 3, 2007
.....

NOTIFICATION OF REASON FOR REFUSAL

Patent Application No. 2001-580062

Dated: November 29, 2007

Patent Office Examiner: M. YAMAZAKI

Attorney for Applicant: Mr. Masao OKABE, et al

Applicable Law: Article 29, Para.2, Article 36, Article 37

This application should be refused because of the following reasons. The applicant may submit a reply within three months from the transmittal date of this letter.

REASON

1. This application is not patentable under Article 29, Paragraph 2 of Patent Law, because the present invention defined in the claims listed below is easily made by a person in the skilled in the art based on the listed references published prior to the filing date of the application.

NOTE

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-19, 25, 29-32, and 34-38;
References 1, 2, 3;

Note;

The references 1-3 respectively disclose that a reinforcing tape is applied to a carton in order to reinforce carton blanks. A person in the art may easily apply this technique to paper board which should be reinforced. It is only a design matter to print on the reinforcement tape. Moreover, a person in the art may easily position a tape so as not to cover a fold line, because the carton is difficult to be fold if the fold line is covered by a tape.

Claims 2, 26-28;

References 1, 2, 3;

Note;

In addition to the above Note regarding claim 1, it is only a design choice to use a paperboard as a reinforcement tape blank.

Claims 6, 33;

References 1, 2, 3;

Note;

In addition to the above Note regarding claim 1, it is obvious for a person in the art to form a double thickness of a reinforcement tape in order to increase reinforcement.

List of Prior Art References

Reference 1: JP08-310525
Reference 2: JP49-112779
Reference 3: USP5,746,871

2. The claim descriptions of this application do not comply with a formality requirement provided by Article 36 Paragraph 6(2).

Note;

Claims 14, 15, 27, 28, 37, and 38;

The terms "paperboard trim" and "paperboard cull" are indefinite.

3. The present application does not comply with a unity requirement provided by Article 37.

The technical problem to be solved by the invention of claims 1-16, 25-38 and the invention of claims 17-24 relates to a reinforcement of a carton. Such a problem, however, has been resolved prior to the present application (see the above references 1-3, for example), and the both inventions do not comply with a requirement provided by Article 37(1).

Moreover, the specified feature corresponding to the technical problem to be solved by the both inventions is to apply a reinforcing material to a part of the carton, however, such a specified feature is disclosed in the cited references 1-3, and there is no main element corresponding to the specified feature which is novel. Accordingly, the both invention do not comply with a requirement provided by Article 37(2).

Furthermore, the both inventions do not comply with requirements provided by Article 37(3), (4), and (5). Accordingly, the relation between the inventions of claims 1-16, 25-38 and the invention of claims 17-24 does not comply with a unity requirement.

Since the present application does not comply with a unity requirement, claims other than claims 1-16 and 25-38 have not been examined.

(Notice for amendments)

(1) The applicant is requested to underline the amended portions of the description (rule 13, note 6)

(2) The applicant is requested to show a basis that the amended description is supported in the originally filed specification.

Record search for Prior Art References

Following additional References are listed only for the purpose of noticing the Applicant to consider related art, and the novelty/inventive step for the claims presently on file does not appear to be denied by this record.

Searched technical field: IPC B231B 1/00-49/04 B31C 1/00-13/00, B31D 1/00-5/04

This record is not a basis of the reasons for the rejection.